

Letter of correction to the Building Code Review Board for the 2020 National Electrical Code Amendments

8-5-21

FROM

PERFORMANCE ELECTRICAL TRAINING LLC.

After reading the comments for the amendments for the 2020 NEC one letter needs correction.

One letter stated that GFCI for ranges and dryers were \$500.000 per year for a city. This is totally incorrect and overly inflated just like the rest of the amendment proposed by this organization this person belongs to with. This organization members is in the sub-committee and others that are the driving force of all the electrical amendments in the past due to cost not safety. All of the amendment are less stringent than the code and my amendment in the city of Portsmouth is more stringent and safer. My first letter that was not read at the first meeting stated that in Portsmouth we had 2000 to 2500 ranges and dryers installed over a **4 year period** with only 11 issues state in my letter. This person letter stated \$500.00 a year for a city and this is how he came up with this inflated number to try to convince the board of the cost.

2500 ranges +2500 dryers= 5000 X \$100 breaker = \$500.000 a year this is total false.

This is what my letter said and is fact not fiction.

2500 ranges and dryers combined X \$100 breaker = \$250.000 divided by 4 years since adoption in Portsmouth is \$62.500 per year with a 4 year cost of construction over one **BILLION** dollars in the city. **So \$500.00 a year is so far from what the facts are is incredible.**

GFCI protection from ranges and dryers in 210.8A again in the letter only states one instance of electrocution. My letter again state 4 electrocutions 3 were kids.

The mini splits needing a switch is still on the OPLC web sites since 2014 and was put on the web site by a former chief state electrical inspector that is also mention in his letter. Nothing has changed in the code since 2014 for the switches. And again over inflated per installation by the amendment. So my question is what changed in the code?? **It's ok to put on the web site then try to change the code with the amendment 6 years later? Maybe we should ask the former chief what changed other than cost.**

Also in this person letter, it states cost 14 times, safety 2 times and life safety 0 times. To me this person letter is 100% about cost, even a transformer sign for as an amendment and a cost of \$50 is again over inflated and waste of time for this board.

I hope this board votes on each amendment one at a time instead of one vote for all the amendments.

This board should not rush to make any deadlines by the 28th.

Again in this person letter it states that the person that put this new code in the NEC should show proof. If you want proof on how this passed, just look in the proposals and public inputs and 1st and 2nd drafts on NFPA web site. **THERE IS THE PROOF. The proof should be why these amendment should be approved and why we should take safety out of the electrical code for a matter a dollars. The sub- committee has not proven this in any way other than cost.**

If these amendments pass the new fight will be at the state house and newspapers and we will see what the public thinks.

PERFORMANCE ELECTRICAL TRAINING LLC.

John Plourde

Feel free to call at 944-0756 for any question after 4:30 pm